

Serial No. 09/744,046

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbeiter in view of Seidler. The examiner states that Arbeiter discloses a bicycle shift mechanism comprising a housing having an opening configured to receive a control cable but does not disclose a closure member having an extension, a thickened portion, a molded recess, an upper lip and a lower lip wherein said upper lip and said lower lip engage an edge of said opening. Further, the examiner states, however, Seidler discloses a closure member 12 made of elastic material having a thickened extension 20 extending into a body 14, a hinge 18; an upper lip 26 which rests over the edge of an installation opening; and a lower lip 29 sliding under the edge of the installation opening. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a closure member including an extension insertable through the installation opening and attachable to an interior of the housing. Seidler discloses a hinged lid 12 having hooked shaped tabs 20 that are inserted into recesses 42 which are not installation openings as claimed in the present invention. Accordingly, the combination of Arbeiter and Seidler fails to disclose a closure member having an extension insertable through an installation opening and attachable to an interior of the housing. Therefore, the obviousness rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected as claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since claims 3-5 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of claim 1 as amended, they are felt to overcome the obviousness rejection in the same manner as amended claim 1.


Serial No. 09/744,046

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbeiter in view of Seidler as applied to claims 1, 3-5 and 7 and further in view of Robbins et al. Since claim 6 depends from and contains all the limitations of claim 1 as amended, it is felt to overcome the obviousness rejection in the same manner as amended claim 1.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the Examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT WESSEL



Lisa J. Wunderlich, Attorney

Registration No. 40,307

SRAM Corporation

1333 N. Kingsbury, 4th Floor

Chicago, IL 60622

(312) 664-8800 ext. 1393